

opposition." The two men agreed to try to unite a divided country, while recognizing their differences.

No one ever asked me or any other persons portrayed in the movie what the facts were.

COFFEE HIS BEVERAGE

The Nixon on Stone's screen drinks almost constantly and comes off as an evil, angry buffoon who believes that his problems center on not being understood by anyone including his wife.

Nixon was not a teetotaler, but coffee was his beverage during the day, and I can recall only a half-dozen times in almost 50 years when I saw him bordering on too much to drink during the evening.

Stone touches on Nixon's feelings toward the Kennedys, and at one point Nixon is seen staring at a picture of President Kennedy and asking: "When they look at you they see what they want to be. When they look at me, they see what they are."

That probably portrays Nixon's true feelings. He disparaged "Eastern intellectuals" and yet he knew that, in truth, he was an "intellectual" who liked to feel he was outside the Eastern elite community. Some of those he admired most were eliteist. He resented the fact that the Kennedys "got away with everything" and that the news media and Congress looked for faults where he could be criticized. At one time, (chief domestic-policy adviser) John Ehrlichman Persuaded Nixon to set up a Camelot-like "royal guard" for the White House. That lasted only a few days.

The most dramatic parts of the film come in conversations between Dick and Pat Nixon. Those obviously are fabrications since no one witnessed them. Allen plays Pat Nixon's role well and shows her to be family-oriented, warm and intelligent. The Pat Nixon I knew also was a strong and caring "first lady." The film wrongly portrays her as a chain smoker. She smoked occasionally in private.

Nixon used to say everyone loves Pat. He was right.

During the scenes between the president and his wife, Nixon refers to her with the nickname "Buddy." I had never heard that, Nixon's daughter, Tricia Cox, whose White House wedding is portrayed tastefully, told me she never heard her father use the name Buddy, but she does recall that Buddy was a childhood nickname for her mother.

Julie Nixon Eisenhower also is shown pleading with her father not to quit. That was a plea Julie made, but the passion of the real Julie was far greater than that of the actress (Annabeth Gish) who portrays her.

STONE OBSESSION

As I watched the film unfold, the most surprising innuendoes concerned Castro, the Bay of Pigs and a mysterious attempt by Stone to insinuate that there was some type of plot involving Nixon, Howard Hunt, the CIA, J. Edgar Hoover, the Mafia and the Kennedy assassination.

Over the years, I have heard discredited theories involving the CIA or the FBI, Kennedy and the Mafia and attempts to assassinate Castro. Stone seems to attach these long repudiated stories to Nixon as if the former president had some part in the death of John Kennedy. That, of course, is pure Stone obsession on Kennedy assassination plots.

The vagaries of the Cuban-plot theories did stir within me memories of some of the most tense moments of the Nixon campaign against Kennedy in 1960.

Just prior to the fourth and final debate between the two candidates, both men addressed an American Legion convention in Miami, Kennedy got major applause with comments about organizing a force to attack

Castro. Nixon knew that such Cuban refugee troops were being trained secretly by the CIA under President Eisenhower's direction. Nixon felt that for him to take this hard line, as had Kennedy would break the code of secrecy he held as vice president. He, therefore, was made to look weak with a suggestion urging a blockade.

The encounter made Nixon so angry that it was difficult to prepare him for the all-important final debate. He had me call CIA Director Allen Dulles to see if Dulles had told Kennedy about the secret training exercise. Dulles denied this, but Nixon did not believe him. This exercise later became the Bay of Pigs.

In the final days of the 1960 campaign, Nixon was forced during the debate to take a weaker position than he believed in, and Kennedy scored points.

None of this was in the movie, but I recall taking reporters to Club 21 for a drink, hoping that would distract them from what was going on.

I became angry during the movie when Nixon was portrayed in sinister fashion as ready to bomb civilians in Hanoi, North Vietnam. Stone goes to the trouble of showing Nixon turning back a steak that was so raw that blood covered his plate. This bloody scene was supposed to be symbolic, but it almost made me sick.

The fact is that Hanoi was bombed, and nearby Haiphong was mined, a bold move that forced the North Vietnamese to agree to a cease-fire. I recalled that Henry Kissinger and I were in Hanoi immediately afterward, and I saw with my own eyes that Hanoi civilians were spared, but military targets such as bridges and airfields were hit with precision. This was not in the movie.

Among those who will resent this film most will be Henry Kissinger. Only recently, he was unfairly depicted as being evil in Turner Broadcasting's TV movie, "Kissinger and Nixon." In the Stone movie, Kissinger appears to be a devious fat, sycophant who was almost ousted from the White House staff by (White House chief of staff) Bob Haldeman and aide Chuck Colson.

One of Kissinger's happiest moments was when he won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1973. The disparaging movies may provide Kissinger with some new low points in life.

When, in "Nixon," I saw the Kissinger character having lunch or dinner with reporters at Washington's Sans Souci restaurant, I recalled dining in the same cafe and often wondering what Kissinger was leaking. This did become a White House controversy, and he may have wondered the same thing about me.

But the movie's implication that Kissinger was about to lose his job was the opposite of truth. The film reminded me of times when I was in Haldeman's office or on an airplane and heard Kissinger—then the frustrated national security adviser—seek to displace Secretary of State Bill Rogers. No one effectively threatened Kissinger.

For me, the saddest moments of the movie came near the end, when Nixon finally begins to comprehend that he has lost the battle, that he is about to be forced from office. I had left the staff a year earlier.

Stone is more sympathetic in these scenes and allows Nixon to ask why no one remembers what he did in ending the war, in opening relations with China and what he did in the SALT treaty agreements with the Soviet Union.

I left the theater wondering why the movie was made and seeking quiet where I could again sort out fact and fiction.

I also pondered the coincidence that within less than two years after Nixon's death, we suddenly see a flurry of shows reviving the Vietnam War and Watergate—TNT's "Kissin-

ger and Nixon," Stone's "Nixon" and a forthcoming History Channel program titled "The Real Richard Nixon" 3½ documentary hours of Tricky Dick."

The A&E Channel also has scheduled a two-hour presentation of Nixon on "Biography," to air in January. Its producers say it is a true documentary.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES, VETERANS, AND CHILDREN BEING HURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor this evening to voice my utter dismay at how our Federal employees, our veterans, and children are being treated by this GINGRICH-led farce called leadership. Republicans are hurting those who do not deserve it. We have dedicated employees in the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments who are being manipulated by those who claim that they care about the American people. We have Medicare recipients and children who will not receive benefits because the Republicans simply do not care. We have devoted State Department employees who were called in from furlough to cope with an airplane disaster in the dangerous hills of Bogota, Colombia. There are individuals who were deemed nonessential and are not being paid but are risking their lives to travel into the guerrilla-controlled hills of Colombia to insure that Americans' lives are protected.

□ 1915

This is the Christmas season. This is the season where good will toward men should be the order of the day. However, we appear to have many Members of this body who have a personal agenda that not only casts a scrooge-like haze over this season and the lives of Americans, but demonstrates a cold-hearted callousness for the well-being of our elderly, our children, our most vulnerable citizens.

I am here this evening because it is a sad day for America and this Congress. We have a few Members of this body holding the entire country hostage, and behaving as if they are, in fact, involved in a guerrilla war themselves, high up in the hills of the Sierra Madre. It is unfortunate that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have truly made this a season not to be jolly.

I also have a lot of constituents who are undergoing quite a bit of concern right now as it relates to the 11th Congressional District and the recent ruling from the judges that really turns the entire congressional map upside down, topsy-turvy, and places incumbent Members of Congress in the same district, and generally creates havoc on the congressional election plain, just a few short months away.

While we are here trying to protect the rights of average, ordinary Americans who are going to be hurt by this

shutdown of government services, we also need to note that, particularly to my constituents who are concerned, that also the Department of Justice is shut down. That means that if there are some who are interested in the timely filing of an appeal to the Supreme Court for the drastic measures that were taken by the lower court in Georgia, we are just out of luck, because the Department of Justice is among those whose Federal employees have been called off of the job.

We have definitely got to do something to put our Federal employees back to work. The work of our government employees is necessary, it is essential, it is valuable, and it is critical. To deny our Federal employees paychecks just a few days before Christmas is about the most cold-hearted kind of treatment that I have ever, ever thought that anybody could visit upon other people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIAHRT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SAXTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FRESHMAN REPUBLICANS DEDICATE THEMSELVES TO GETTING AMERICA'S FINANCIAL HOUSE IN ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the greatest privileges in the world to serve in Congress and represent constituents who have sent you to Washington. I have had the pleasure as well to represent a smaller constituency in the State House in Hartford, and it never ceased to amaze me, as a State legislator, how I as a State legislator had to make sure that our State had its financial house in order, and yet the Federal Government could deficit spend. I often wondered how those men and women in Congress could do such a terrible thing to our country, to burden future generations with horrific debt, on which we have to pay annual interest payments which are in excess of over \$235 billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, when I got down to Washington I vowed that getting our financial house in order would be my first and highest priority, making sure that we balanced our Federal budget. I have seen during the past 8 years that there has been here a greater awareness that we needed to do this and more and more Members willing to put their, candidly, political lives on the line to do that.

I pay special salute to the freshman class that have joined us this year, because this number of 73 Members has given us the opportunity to lead. We

have not had an opportunity as a Republican conference to lead in 40 years. What we have done in that short period of time, Mr. Speaker, I think is extraordinary. We passed major reforms in the first day of the session by reducing the size of Congress, reducing the number of committees, reducing the staff on committees, requiring or no longer allowing proxy votes, requiring all committee meetings to be open to the public, requiring that Congress live under all the laws we impose on everyone else. I want to say that again; to require Congress to live by all the laws that we impose on everyone else.

Mr. Speaker, we not only voted during the beginning of the year for a balanced budget amendment, but we did something obviously more important, we voted to balance the budget. That is what I want to address at this point.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget. At the same time we are going to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, from insolvency and then ultimately bankruptcy. Our Medicare fund will go bankrupt if we do not take corrective action to restore funds in the Medicare Part A fund, which will go bankrupt in 7 years. We are looking to transform our caretaking social and corporate welfare state into a caring opportunity society. We are set to do all three of these objectives, and we are working hard to accomplish that task.

Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Rabin, who was the former prime minister in Israel, made it very clear that he viewed his responsibility this way. He said he was elected by adults to represent the children. That is what I think Members in Congress have to do. We are talking about not having a horrific debt that mortgages our country's future.

We have a plan. The plan is very simple: We balance the budget in 7 years. Admittedly, we have a tax cut. What do we do? We balance it in 7 years. I could forego a tax cut if we balance the budget in 6 years, but I will be darned if I am going to reduce the tax cuts and then take what we had saved to allow for tax cuts and just spend more money. We are allowing this Government to grow. In the past 7 years we spent \$9 billion. We are going to spend \$12 billion. The issue is should we spend \$13 billion in the next 7 years. We say no. The other issue is we say it should be balanced by the seventh year.

Mr. Speaker, I constantly hear about Republican cuts to the budget. They are just not true. At least they are not true when they refer to the earned income tax credit, a very important program to provide proactive financial assistance to individuals who do not pay taxes, but work. The earned income tax credit grows from \$19.9 to \$25.4 billion. The school lunch program under our plan grows from \$5.1 to \$6.8 billion. The student loan program grows from \$24.5 to \$36 billion. That is a 50-percent increase.

Only in this place when you spend 50 percent more do people call it a cut; Medicaid, growing from \$9 billion to \$127 billion, Medicare from \$178 billion in the seventh year to \$289 billion. That clearly is an increase in spending.

Mr. Speaker, we are cutting some programs, and maybe some we should not, but we had to make choices. Now it is up to the President. We have spent a whole year working on our budget. We have closed it and advertised it, and have proclaimed it to our constituency and the entire United States. Now it is time for the President to say where his priorities are.

A member of our conference pointed out that we have been authors and the President has been a critic. It is important now that the President be an author of what he favors and show us what he wants, and then compare the two options. I think we can have an agreement on 24 hours, as soon as the President and the leaders in the Democratic side of the aisle, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], determine that the American people want to balance the budget in 7 years and get our financial House in order. We are not asking that they agree to what we are doing with Medicare and Medicaid or the tax program or our discretionary spending. We are asking them to present their plan, see where we agree and, where we agree, case closed. Where we disagree, then iron out our differences.

Ultimately, the President is the President of the United States. He is going to have to pass judgment on what we do. There will have to be an agreement. But rather than compromise, we are looking to find common ground and save this country from bankruptcy. We are determined to get our financial House in order and balance the Federal budget. We are determined to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, from bankruptcy. We are determined to transform this social and corporate welfare state into an opportunity society and end this cycle of 12-year-olds having babies, 14-year-olds selling drugs, 15-year-olds killing each other, 18-year-olds who cannot read their diplomas, 24-year-olds who have never had a job, and 30-year-old grandparents. That has to end.

We need to transform this society into truly what is an opportunity society. I look forward to doing that, and working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to accomplish that task. Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude by saying I am proud to serve in this incredible opportunity as a Member of Congress, and to represent the people of the United States.

REEMPHASIZING THE DETERMINATION OF REPUBLICANS TO BALANCE THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.